

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/576,025	Applicant(s) TAKESHIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Colin Slifka	Art Unit 1793	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Melvin Curtis Mayes.

(3) Mazza Jayaprakash 55299.

(2) Colin Slifka.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 28 May 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed submission of translation to overcome rejection based on Takeshima. Discussed proposed amendments to overcome the 112 rejection and other rejection of record. Examiner expressed that any amendment and arguments with respect to the applied rejection would be reconsidered.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Melvin Curtis Mayes/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793
--	---